REMARKS

The objection to form of claim 11 has been cured by providing antecedent basis for moving picture in line 7 by adding "moving picture" in line 6.

The claims were rejected over the patent to Obikane. However, Obikane does not teach a packetization device to independently packetize at least two heterogeneous video streams. The video streams in Obikane are not heterogeneous.

As explained, for example, in column 8, lines 6-21, the streams SVL and SVM are simply video at two different angles. Namely, the video SVL is low angle video data obtained by photographing a concert by a prescribed musician from the lower part, whereas SVM is video obtained by photographing the concert from the front. Thus, there was never any need to convert the format, frame rate, or other aspects of the video because it was not heterogeneous.

The video streams were prepared specifically to be combined and transmitted together to make up one single television program. As explained, for example, in column 8, lines 6-8, the device shown in Figure 12 is a transmission device of a digital broadcasting system which is to transmit "a plurality of associated video data SVL, SVM, and SVH as one program."

Clearly, this is not heterogeneous video which indicates video from different sources. When the video comes to the user, it is from the same source. Namely, one source provides the two video streams together, that need not be converted in format or frame rate, because they are exactly the same format and frame rate. Since they are the same format and frame rate, they do not constitute heterogeneous moving picture video streams.

Therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In view of these remarks, the application should now be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 23, 2005

Timothy N. Trop
Registration No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, Texas 77024-1805
(713) 468-8880 [Phone]
(713) 468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation

3